

BRIEF REPORT

School Experiences of Young Children and Their Lesbian and Gay Adoptive Parents

Rachel H. Farr
University of Kentucky

M. K. Oakley
University of Massachusetts Amherst

Elizabeth W. Ollen
Clark University

While ample literature exists about psychosocial outcomes for children with lesbian and gay (LG) parents (e.g., Moore & Stambolis-Ruhstorfer, 2013), less is known about their school experiences. This study examined school-age children's behavioral adjustment and school experiences from 96 LG parents, their 50 children, and 48 teachers of these children. Participants were from the second wave (W2) of a larger study (Farr et al., 2010). Fifty-four same-sex parent families were recruited through five private domestic infant adoption agencies. Children averaged 8 years old at W2. Parents and teachers completed the Child Behavior Checklist and Teacher Report Form; children and parents were interviewed about school experiences, teasing, and bullying. Transcribed interviews were coded, including children's microaggression experiences. Results showed that parents and teachers reported few child behavior problems, comparable to population averages. Moreover, 98% of parents reported their children had adjusted well to school; 95 of 96 parents felt supported by schools. While only 8% of parents reported that their children had been teased or bullied for having LG parents, these four children also perceived more microaggressions and were reported to have more behavior problems by parents and teachers. Thus, school-age children adopted by LG parents appear to be well adjusted overall. Bullied child participants, however, exhibited more behavioral difficulties based on parent and teacher report. Thus, despite school support around family structure, children with LG parents may experience unique challenges related to family structure during early school years. Implications for educational policy and practice are discussed.

Keywords: adopted children, sexual minority parents, schools, teasing and bullying

Recent estimates suggest that between 2.0 and 3.7 million children are being raised by lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) adults in the United States, according to 2013 National Health Interview Survey and Gallup Poll data (Gates, 2014).

Growing numbers of children with sexual minority parents translate to increased challenges for schools to meet the needs of these families (Byard, Kosciw, & Bartkiewicz, 2013). While ample literature exists about psychosocial outcomes for children with lesbian and gay (LG) parents (e.g., Moore & Stambolis-Ruhstorfer, 2013), less is known about these children's school experiences. Similarly, few studies have examined perceptions of sexual minority parents regarding interactions with children's schools (Goldberg & Smith, 2014). Bronfenbrenner's (2001) ecological systems theory emphasizes the role of environmental contexts in understanding children's development. As such, interactions between children and parents with school settings represent a critical mesosystem to consider when examining children's adjustment within LG-parent families. Knowledge about how same-sex parent families intersect with school environments would contribute to a better understanding of underlying factors that might account for comparable outcomes among families with heterosexual and nonheterosexual parents (Goldberg, 2010).

Over 30 years of research have consistently indicated that children with sexual minority parents show typical development and positive outcomes, as compared to children with heterosexual parents. Children with LG parents are no more likely than those with heterosexual

This article was published Online First June 20, 2016.

Rachel H. Farr, Department of Psychology, University of Kentucky; M. K. Oakley, Department of Psychological and Brain Sciences, University of Massachusetts Amherst; Elizabeth W. Ollen, Department of Psychology, Clark University.

This research was supported by funding from the American Psychological Foundation's Wayne F. Placek Grant awarded to Rachel H. Farr (Wave 2). The first author was also supported by funds from the Rudd Family Foundation Chair in Psychology at the University of Massachusetts Amherst. We thank the members of our research team who have contributed to the design and execution of the overall project, as well as all the adoptive families who generously shared their experiences with us and have made this research possible.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Rachel H. Farr, Department of Psychology, University of Kentucky, 012-B Kastle Hall, 171 Funkhouser Drive, Lexington, KY 40506-0044. E-mail: rachel.farr@uky.edu

parents to have problems with behavioral adjustment, academic achievement, peer relationships, gender development, romantic relationships, or sexual identity (Biblarz & Stacey, 2010; Goldberg, 2010; Moore & Stambolis-Ruhstorfer, 2013; Potter, 2012; Rosenfeld, 2010). Questions persist, however, about whether children with LG parents face greater challenges with peers than do other children. Despite data indicating that sexual orientation and gender expression are among top reasons children are bullied (Kosciw, Greytak, Diaz, & Bartkiewicz, 2010), we know little about bullying due to the sexual orientation of children's parents.

Nonetheless, some studies have examined whether children with sexual minority parents experience bullying as a direct result of their parents' sexual orientation. In a national sample of Grades K–12 in the United States, Kosciw and Diaz (2008) found that among children with LGBT parents, 40% reported being harassed and 23% felt unsafe at school due to their family structure; the majority, however, did not report mistreatment due to having LGBT parents (Kosciw & Diaz, 2008). Studies in the United States and United Kingdom comparing victimization rates between children with same- and other-sex parents have not revealed significant differences (Rivers, Poteat, & Noret, 2008; Tasker & Golombok, 1995; Wainright & Patterson, 2006, 2008). Although children with same-sex parents may be no more likely to experience overt bullying, these children appear to face instances of microaggressions, characterized as more subtle or unintentional insults related to having sexual minority parents (Farr, Crain, Oakley, Cashen, & Garber, 2016).

Aligned with Bronfenbrenner's (2001) ecological theory regarding the impact of broader contexts of social interactions on individual development, there is reason to believe that even microaggressions could result in negative psychosocial outcomes for children. For example, data suggest that children who are bullied, regardless of the reason, generally experience psychological and behavioral maladjustment (Guhn, Schonert-Reichl, Gademann, Hymel, & Hertzman, 2013; Lereya, Copeland, Costello, & Wolke, 2015). Thus, research more closely examining the extent to which bullying in school environments may differentially affect certain children, such as those with nonheterosexual parents, is timely.

To date, research has focused on the engagement of LG parents in their children's schools, as well as disclosure practices among parents and children about family structure. Casper, Schultz, and Wickens (1992) revealed that LG parents experienced stress related to hiding and disclosing their sexual orientation at their children's school. This parental stress is often experienced by children with LG parents as they are faced with decisions about whether and how to disclose their family structure (Farr et al., 2016; Fitzgerald, 1999; Vanfraussen, Ponjaert-Kristoffersen, & Brewaeys, 2002). Goldberg and Smith (2014) found that LG adoptive parents who had greater frequency of interactions with children's teachers reported more positive relationships with them. Perceptions of feeling accepted by other parents were also related to greater school involvement among LG parents. Thus, the role of a supportive community for LG parents appears prominently linked with school engagement.

Beyond school engagement, other studies have explored the extent to which school curricula, policies, and practices are inclusive of LGBT parent families. Heteronormative family ideals are commonly reinforced in schools (Casper & Schultz, 1999). Even in school districts comprised of numerous LGBT parent families, few appear to have comprehensive curricula, policies, or practices

surrounding family diversity (Bishop & Atlas, 2015). Yet, data suggest that schools that have inclusive curricula and allocate greater resources to LGBT issues offer a more supportive climate not only for sexual minority students, but also for sexual minority parent families (Byard et al., 2013). More research, however, is necessary to directly explore the school experiences of children and parents in LGBT-parent families.

The Current Study

To better understand the perceptions of school experiences among children and parents in LG-parent families, as well as associations with children's adjustment, this mixed-methods study examined school-age children's behavioral adjustment and school experiences from a sample of 96 LG adoptive parents, their 50 children, and 48 of the children's teachers. Using Bronfenbrenner's (2001) framework that interactions with school settings can profoundly impact children's development, we were interested in assessing these experiences from multiple perspectives. Also aligned with the dynamic nature of this theory, we included both parent and teacher reports of child adjustment. We hypothesized that LG parents and children's teachers would report typical levels of child behavior problems via standardized questionnaires, consistent with existing literature indicating healthy adjustment among children with same-sex parents (Farr, Forssell, & Patterson, 2010; Moore & Stambolis-Ruhstorfer, 2013). Based on earlier research and via individual interviews, we expected that LG parents would indicate feeling generally supported by children's schools and report that their children had adjusted well to school (Goldberg & Smith, 2014). Finally, we predicted that some parents would report in their interviews that children had experienced teasing or bullying due to family structure (Byard et al., 2013). As such, we expected that bullied children would be more likely to have experienced microaggressions resulting from having same-sex parents (coded from individual interviews with the children; Farr et al., 2016). We expected these bullied children to have worse behavioral adjustment, as reported by parents and teachers (Guhn et al., 2013; Lereya et al., 2015).

Method

Participants

Participants were from the second wave (W2) of a larger study (e.g., Farr et al., 2010). At Wave 1 (W1), 54 same-sex parent families were recruited through five private domestic infant adoption agencies. Participating families were all two-parent families with at least one adopted child between one and five years old at W1 ($M_{\text{age}} = 3$). All parents were the children's legal adoptive parents, and children had been placed at birth or within the first few weeks of life. Families lived across the United States, notably the east and west coasts and the southern United States. Most parents reported full-time employment, high household incomes, and high educational attainment. At W2, children averaged 8.42 years ($SD = 1.57$) and ranged from preschool to sixth grade (median: Grade 2). The sample targeted here involves 96 parents (45 lesbian mothers, 51 gay fathers) and their 50 children (26 girls, 24 boys; representing 50 same-sex parent families—24 with lesbian parents, 26 with gay parents) who participated at W2 and 48

of the children's teachers. About half of families had completed transracial adoptions. Approximately 82% of parents were White (15% were Black and 3% were multiracial or other), while children were more racially diverse: 41% were White, 37% were Black, 16% were multiracial, and 6% were other. Of the 50 children represented by parents' reports, 46 completed individual interviews. The majority of children's teachers were female (88%) and had completed a graduate degree (75%). Their current employment included teaching in public (54%), private (27%), or alternative/other elementary schools (19%). Teachers had known the target children for 18 months, on average, and had been in their present positions an average of 13 years.

Materials

Child behavioral adjustment. To assess children's behavioral adjustment, parents and children's teachers completed the Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL/6–18) and Teacher Report Form (TRF/6–18) for school-age children (Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001). These widely used and standardized measures provide scores of internalizing, externalizing, and total behavior problems via 112 items rated on a 0-to-2 scale where 0 = *not true*, 1 = *somewhat or sometimes true*, and 2 = *very true or often true*. A total score can be calculated from all items; higher numbers reflect more problems. Example items include "lying or cheating" (externalizing); "unhappy, sad, or depressed" (internalizing); and others related to thought, attention, sleep, and social problems. The population mean and standard deviation for both the CBCL/6–18 and TRF/6–18 is 50.0 ± 10.0 (Achenbach, 1991; Achenbach & Rescorla, 2001). CBCL/6–18 sample alphas were .95 for LG parents. TRF/6–18 alphas were .95 and .98 for teachers of children with lesbian and gay parents, respectively.

School experiences, bullying, and microaggressions. To assess children's and parents' school experiences, and to investigate possible teasing and bullying on the basis of having same-sex parents, children and parents were individually interviewed. Children were asked questions, such as, "In school or anywhere else, have you ever been made fun of or teased (e.g., with words, called names, said mean things to you)?" and "Have you ever been physically bullied (e.g., hit, kicked, slapped, punched, etc.)?" If children responded "yes" to either question, they were also probed with the following: "(a) How many times in the last year? (b) Why do you think you were bullied? (c) How did you feel? (d) What did you do when it happened?" Children's interviews were globally coded for instances of microaggressions on the basis of having same-sex parents (Farr et al., 2016). In parents' interviews, the following questions were coded: "Would you say that [child] has adjusted well to school socially (e.g., with peers, friends)? (yes/

no)," "To your knowledge, has [child] ever been bullied, teased, or treated unfairly? If yes, please describe," and, "Do you feel supported as a LG-parent family by your child's school, including by teachers, administrators, coaches and other staff, as well as other children's parents?"

Procedure

At W1, lesbian, gay, and heterosexual couples with young adopted children were contacted via letter or e-mail by their cooperating adoption agency to describe the study and invite participation. At W2, all families who participated at W1 were recontacted by e-mail, phone, and Facebook, and invited to participate in the study a second time. At both waves, families were visited in their homes. During this time, parents and children independently completed survey measures using the Qualtrics survey platform, and the principal investigator individually interviewed the children. At a separate time, parents were interviewed via phone or through a text-based chat by trained graduate students. Participation at both waves was voluntary; no financial compensation was provided. The study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the principal investigator's university. Questionnaire and interview data representing each child were compiled into one SPSS dataset for ease of analysis; interview data were globally or dichotomously coded, such that analyses comparing qualitative and quantitative questionnaire could be facilitated. All variables in this study are represented in Table 1, with the type of data and informant noted.

Semi-structured child and parent interviews, which were video- and audio-recorded, respectively, were transcribed and coded by trained research personnel for responses about children's and parents' school experiences. Children and parents were asked a series of questions inquiring about their family and adoption that were developed for the larger longitudinal project and adapted from other adoptive family studies (e.g., Grotevant, McRoy, Wrobel, & Ayers-Lopez, 2013). Dichotomous yes/no responses from parents' interviews related to bullying and teasing, children's adjustment, and perceptions of support provided discrete codes (1 = yes; 2 = no), rated by trained research assistants.

Children's entire interview transcripts ($n = 46$) were globally coded for microaggression experiences by three trained research assistants using deductive thematic analysis, a process which allows for patterns (i.e., themes) to be identified, analyzed, and reported (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Numbers of microaggression instances, as well as subthemes, were identified, combined, and differentiated through a winnowing process until consensus across coders was reached through discussion (Harwood & Copfer, 2015; Wolcott, 1990). Microaggression instances were counted when

Table 1
Measures Utilized at Wave 2

Concept assessed	Measure	Nature of data represented	Informant
Child behavior problems	Child Behavior Checklist	Quantitative	Parents
Child behavior problems	Teacher Report Form	Quantitative	Teachers
Child school adjustment	Semi-structured parent interview	Qualitative	Parents
Parent perceptions of school support	Semi-structured parent interview	Qualitative	Parents
Parent perceptions of bullying/teasing	Semi-structured parent interview	Qualitative	Parents
Microaggression experiences	Semi-structured child interview	Qualitative	Children

children provided distinct responses (e.g., a few words, several sentences) that reflected any subthemes identified in the coding manual. More details on this coding procedure and its results are provided in a separate publication (Farr et al., 2016). Strong reliability was found across ratings (alpha levels of .80 or above), based on Krippendorff's alpha, a fitting statistic to use when there are three or more coders (Krippendorff, 2004).

Results

First, we report on descriptive findings related to each variable of interest; next, we examine associations among variables. Consistent with our first hypothesis, LG parents and teachers reported child behavior problems comparable to population averages of 50 ± 10 for total problems (see Table 2). Paired sample *t* tests revealed no significant differences between parent and teacher reports of children's behavioral adjustment. Similarly, parents' interview data corroborated parent- and teacher-reported survey data—98% of parents felt their children had adjusted well to school.

Aligned with our second hypothesis, 95 of 96 LG parents felt supported by schools as same-sex parents, as indicated by parent interviews. Partially supporting our third hypothesis, very few parents (8%) reported that their children ($n = 4$) had been teased or bullied because of having same-sex parents. More descriptive information about children's experiences with microaggressions have been published elsewhere (Farr et al., 2016).

Next, we explored associations among variables. Consistent with expectations, an independent samples *t* test revealed that children reported by parents as having been teased or bullied because of having same-sex parents perceived more microaggressions (see Table 2). Thus, consistency was found across parent and child interview data. Supporting our final hypothesis, another set of independent *t* tests indicated that children who were bullied were reported by parents and teachers to have more behavior problems (see Table 2). This was particularly the case for teacher-reported internalizing problems and parent-reported externalizing problems (internalizing problems were marginally significant).

Discussion

Overall, parents and teachers agreed that their school-age children adopted by LG parents appeared to be well-adjusted; parents reported

positive transitions to the school environment and few behavior problems among their children. Similarly, LG adoptive parents generally felt supported by schools, teachers, and administrators. Our findings suggest, however, that at least a few children adopted by same-sex parents were reported by parents to have experienced teasing or bullying due to their family structure. Consistent with hypotheses drawn from Bronfenbrenner's (2001) ecological theory of development, it was these children who reported more microaggressions from peers. For example, one child stated, ". . . a lot of people just try to make fun of you because your family is different . . . I just don't think they should bully us because we're different." Another example captured a child's discomfort of being "outed" for having same-sex parents: ". . . a lot of times I don't like always tell them but it comes out because we do a lot of parent things like we have parties and they come in for parent-teacher conferences." Children who were bullied were also reported to have more externalizing behavioral challenges at home and internalizing problems at school, by parents and teachers, respectively. Thus, despite LG parents' perceptions of school support around their family structure, some children with LG parents may experience unique challenges during early school years.

These findings are consistent with the broader literature indicating that children with LG parents show healthy psychological and behavioral adjustment, including social adjustment to school (e.g., Biblarz & Stacey, 2010; Goldberg, 2010). Our results were supported by parent- and teacher-reported questionnaires, as well as parent interviews, in which 94 of 96 parents reported that their children adjusted well to school. Moreover, children did not generally appear at risk for bullying and teasing due to having same-sex parents (parents reported only four of 50 children as having had these experiences). Again, these results are corroborated by other population-based studies suggesting that children with LG parents are no more likely to experience victimization than their peers with heterosexual parents (e.g., Rivers et al., 2008; Tasker & Golombok, 1995; Wainright & Patterson, 2006, 2008).

Our findings are also aligned with the few existing studies addressing interactions of sexual minority parents with schools. While we did not directly address parents' school involvement, we did find evidence that LG adoptive parents felt supported overall by their children's schools. Some parents appeared to feel supported due to the presence of families like their own, for instance, "Yes, there's actually quite a few adoptive families at [our child's]

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics for Major Study Variables

Measures	Full sample	Ever been bullied?		<i>t</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>p</i>
	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	Yes	No			
Parents ($n = 96$)						
CBCL: Internalizing	47.10 (10.77)	54.25 (7.67)	46.43 (10.92)	1.98 [†]	.42	.051
CBCL: Externalizing	49.79 (11.23)	57.00 (6.57)	49.10 (11.64)	2.99*	.63	.012
CBCL: Total	49.02 (11.90)	55.63 (7.23)	48.36 (12.23)	1.64	.35	.104
Teachers ($n = 48$)						
TRF: Internalizing	48.63 (8.41)	55.25 (4.74)	48.30 (8.45)	2.29*	.68	.025
TRF: Externalizing	51.58 (7.67)	49.75 (7.42)	51.84 (7.74)	-.73	.22	.467
TRF: Total	51.08 (8.55)	53.38 (4.50)	51.05 (8.73)	.74	.22	.234
Children ($n = 46$)						
Microaggressions	1.19 (1.47)	3.38 (2.67)	.99 (1.12)	2.51*	.76	.039

Note. CBCL = Child Behavior Checklist; TRF = Teacher Report Form.

[†] $p < .10$. * $p < .05$.

school, and there's quite a few same sex couples at [our child's] school." Another parent said, "We feel very supported in [our child's] school as a same-sex family and feel very supported in [our child's] school as an adoptive family." Parents likely felt positively about children's teachers and/or that their family systems were positively represented at children's schools. Indeed, in [Goldberg and Smith's \(2014\)](#) study, LG parents were more likely to report positive relationships with their young children's teachers than heterosexual parents; yet no family group was more likely to be involved in their child's school. Similarly, [Fedewa and Clark \(2009\)](#) used a nationally representative sample to examine heterosexual and same-sex parent school involvement and found no differences by family type. Taken together, these findings underscore the importance of querying parents about different facets of their interactions with children's schools, such as level of involvement, perceptions of support and representation, and individual relationships with teachers and administrators.

Finally, there were a few children with same-sex parents in this sample who experienced bullying due to their family structure. When parents reported that children had been bullied for this reason, these same children independently reported experiencing microaggressions from peers for having same-sex parents. Thus, there was corroboration between the reports of the children ($M_{\text{age}} = 8$ years) and their parents. Such consensus is noteworthy, as other studies examining socialization experiences have not always found agreement between the reports of parents and school-age children (e.g., [Marshall, 1995](#)). Our findings may reflect the frequency and quality of communication between parents and children in these families; future research could further explore how same-sex parents socialize their children around family structure ([Oakley, Farr, & Scherer, 2016](#)). Children who were bullied, per parents' reports, were also reported to have greater internalizing problems by their teachers and greater externalizing problems by their parents. Such consistency between parents and teachers in this sample may reflect parents' involvement in schools and/or parental perceptions of support from teachers; certainly, there is some evidence that LG adoptive parents are more satisfied with school experiences when parents have more frequent contact with children's teachers ([Goldberg & Smith, 2014](#)).

Strengths, Limitations, and Future Research Directions

The primary strength of this study is the inclusion of multiple informants—children, parents, and teachers—in exploring school experiences and associations with child outcomes among members of LG-parent families. Multiple data sources enhance the study's rigor and generalizability. There are, however, several limitations. Our cross-sectional findings only indicate associations between bullying and behavioral problems, rather than a causal relationship. Furthermore, this is a relatively small and homogenous sample of 50 families who represented one particular pathway to adoption in which children were placed as infants within the United States and not at older ages, from other countries, or after experiences of institutionalization or other disruptions in early life—all factors that may affect families' interactions with schools. Thus, more diverse adoptive and LG-parent families should be recruited in future research. It would also be interesting to

follow-up with these families when the children are older and exposed to expanded social milieus.

In addition, our study examined only a few aspects of child and parent school experiences. Thus, future research should seek to understand more about children's day-to-day experiences navigating school environments (e.g., perceptions of school climate, relationships with teachers, representations of family diversity in curricula) through more in-depth qualitative analyses. Recent research suggests that children adopted by LG parents experience feelings of difference and microaggressions from peers, due to family structure ([Farr et al., 2016](#)); additional research could shed light on how these experiences could be minimized or buffered in school settings. More information is also needed about factors contributing to parents' perceptions of support from children's schools and how these perceptions relate to school involvement.

Implications for Policy and Practice

Our findings reveal that at least some children with LG parents face consequences to adjustment associated with homophobic school bullying. Moreover, even when bullying is not overt, children adopted by same-sex parents may experience heterosexual microaggressions ([Farr et al., 2016](#)). Given increasing numbers of school-age children with sexual minority parents in the U.S., these findings highlight the need for educators to be attuned to the school experiences of sexual minority parent families ([Byard et al., 2013](#)). Certainly across many U.S. schools, improvement is needed in terms of inclusive curricula, policies, and practices toward LGBT-parent families ([Bishop & Atlas, 2015](#)). Teachers are in a critical intervention position for children who encounter school bullying. By cultivating caring classroom environments in which children's sensitivity to difference is heightened and by directly intervening to halt discriminatory peer interactions, teachers can promote positive well-being among all children in their classrooms ([Troop-Gordon, 2015](#)). Thus, our results may inform teacher training on family diversity and peer relationships, as well as educational policy and practice related to ongoing antibullying efforts.

Conclusion

As the number of school-age children with LGBT parents increases in the United States, the time is ripe for schools to respond to expanding family diversity by creating more inclusive curricula and policies. Antibullying and anti-LGBT bias campaigns continue to address issues related to sexual orientation, gender expression, and diverse family structures in schools ([Byard et al., 2013](#)), yet, even with high levels of school support, our findings indicate that children bullied on the basis of having LG parents also demonstrate greater behavioral problems. Thus, it is critical that future research continues to explore the unique experiences characterized by the diversity of LG-parent families. When schools serve the needs of all children and parents, prospects are bolstered for children's educational success and healthy development. Thus, it is paramount that teachers, administrators, and parents work together to ensure that school environments are safe and welcoming of all children and families.

References

- Achenbach, T. M. (1991). *Integrative guide for the 1991 CBCL/4-18, YSR and TRF profiles*. Burlington, VT: Department of Psychiatry, University of Vermont.

- Achenbach, T. M., & Rescorla, L. A. (2001). *Manual for the ASEBA school-age forms & profiles*. Burlington, VT: University of Vermont, Research Center for Children, Youth, & Families.
- Biblarz, T. J., & Stacey, J. (2010). How does the gender of parents matter? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *72*, 3–22. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2009.00678.x>
- Bishop, C. M., & Atlas, J. G. (2015). School curriculum, policies, and practices regarding lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender families. *Education and Urban Society*, *47*, 766–784. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0013124513508580>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*, 77–101. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Bronfenbrenner, U. (2001). The bioecological theory of human development. In U. Bronfenbrenner (Ed.), *Making human beings human: Bioecological perspectives on human development* (pp. 3–15). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Byard, E., Kosciw, J., & Bartkiewicz, M. (2013). Schools and LGBT-parent families: Creating change through programming and advocacy. In A. E. Goldberg & K. R. Allen (Eds.), *LGBT-Parent Families: Innovations in Research and Implications for Practice* (pp. 275–290). New York, NY: Springer. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-4556-2_18
- Casper, V., & Schultz, S. (1999). *Gay parents/straight schools: Building communication and trust*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Casper, V., Schultz, S., & Wickens, E. (1992). Breaking the silences: Lesbian and gay parents and the schools. *Teachers College Record*, *94*, 109–137.
- Farr, R. H., Crain, E. E., Oakley, M. K., Cashen, K. K., & Garber, K. J. (2016). Microaggressions, feelings of difference, and resilience among adopted children with sexual minority parents. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *45*, 85–104. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-015-0353-6>
- Farr, R. H., Forssell, S. L., & Patterson, C. J. (2010). Parenting and child development in adoptive families: Does parental sexual orientation matter? *Applied Developmental Science*, *14*, 164–178. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2010.500958>
- Fedewa, A., & Clark, T. (2009). Parent practices and home-school partnerships: A differential effect for children with same-sex coupled parents? *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, *5*, 312–339. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15504280903263736>
- Fitzgerald, B. (1999). Children of lesbian and gay parents: A review of the literature. *Marriage & Family Review*, *29*, 57–75. http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J002v29n01_05
- Gates, G. J. (2014, October). *LGB families and relationships: Analyses of the 2013 National Health Interview Survey*. Williams Institute, UCLA School of Law. Retrieved from <http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/lgb-families-nhis-sep-2014.pdf>
- Goldberg, A. E. (2010). *Lesbian and gay parents and their children: Research on the family life cycle*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/12055-000>
- Goldberg, A. E., & Smith, J. Z. (2014). Predictors of school engagement among same-sex and heterosexual adoptive parents of kindergarteners. *Journal of School Psychology*, *52*, 463–478. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2014.08.001>
- Grotevant, H. D., McRoy, R. G., Wrobel, G. M., & Ayers-Lopez, S. (2013). Contact between adoptive and birth families: Perspectives from the Minnesota/Texas Adoption Research Project. *Child Development Perspectives*, *7*, 193–198. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12039>
- Guhn, M., Schonert-Reichl, K. A., Gademann, A. M., Hymel, S., & Hertzman, C. (2013). A population study of victimization, relationships, and well-being in middle childhood. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *14*, 1529–1541. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10902-012-9393-8>
- Harwood, D., & Copfer, S. (2015). “Your lunch pail is silly!” Children’s and teachers’ views on teasing. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education*, *29*, 26–41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02568543.2014.973126>
- Kosciw, J., & Diaz, E. (2008). Involved, invisible, ignored: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender parents and their children in our nation’s K-12 schools. *GLSEN*. Retrieved from <http://www.glsen.org/sites/default/files/Involved,%20Invisible,%20Ignored%20Full%20Report.pdf>
- Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Diaz, E. M., & Bartkiewicz, M. J. (2010). *The 2009 National School Climate Survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender youth in our nation’s schools*. New York, NY: Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network.
- Krippendorff, K. (2004). *Content analysis: An introduction to its methodology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lereya, S. T., Copeland, W. E., Costello, E. J., & Wolke, D. (2015). Adult mental health consequences of peer bullying and maltreatment in childhood: Two cohorts in two countries. *Lancet Psychiatry*, *2*, 524–531. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366\(15\)00165-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2215-0366(15)00165-0)
- Marshall, S. (1995). Ethnic socialization of African American children: Implications for parenting, identity development, and academic achievement. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *24*, 377–396. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/BF01537187>
- Moore, M. R., & Stambolis-Ruhstorfer, M. (2013). LGBT sexuality and families at the start of the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *39*, 491–507. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-071312-145643>
- Oakley, M. K., Farr, R. H., & Scherer, D. G. (2016). Same-sex parent socialization: Understanding gay and lesbian parenting practices as cultural socialization. *Journal of GLBT Family Studies*, 1–20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1550428X.2016.1158685>
- Potter, D. (2012). Same-sex parent families and children’s academic achievement. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *74*, 556–571. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2012.00966.x>
- Rivers, I., Poteat, V. P., & Noret, N. (2008). Victimization, social support, and psychosocial functioning among children of same-sex and opposite-sex couples in the United Kingdom. *Developmental Psychology*, *44*, 127–134. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.44.1.127>
- Rosenfeld, M. J. (2010). Nontraditional families and childhood progress through school. *Demography*, *47*, 755–775. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1353/dem.0.0112>
- Tasker, F., & Golombok, S. (1995). Adults raised as children in lesbian families. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *65*, 203–215. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0079615>
- Troop-Gordon, W. (2015). The role of the classroom teacher in the lives of children victimized by peers. *Child Development Perspectives*, *9*, 55–60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/cdep.12106>
- Vanfraussen, K., Ponjaert-Kristoffersen, I., & Brewaeys, A. (2002). What does it mean for youngsters to grow up in a lesbian family created by means of donor insemination? *Journal of Reproductive and Infant Psychology*, *20*, 237–252. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0264683021000033165>
- Wainright, J. L., & Patterson, C. J. (2006). Delinquency, victimization, and substance use among adolescents with female same-sex parents. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *20*, 526–530. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.20.3.526>
- Wainright, J. L., & Patterson, C. J. (2008). Peer relations among adolescents with female same-sex parents. *Developmental Psychology*, *44*, 117–126. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.44.1.117>
- Wolcott, H. F. (1990). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Received February 17, 2016

Revision received May 21, 2016

Accepted May 26, 2016 ■